RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

FAX COVER SHEET

APR 2 3 2005

To: USPTO	Date: 04/23/05
Exr. Scanette E. Chapman	
Art Unit 3635	
From: Werner H. Schroeder	
Patent Agent	•
Reg. NO. 36, 387	•
Number of pages including cover sheet:	<u></u>
Comments: Application Nº 10	0/705,573
Response to an Office Act	
TO FORSE 18 AN OFFICE HOP	104
0 1 1	
Signature	

Fax:

PTO/SB/21 (09-04)
Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
spood to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB commit number.
imber 10/705,573

Unriet the Paper	work Reduction Act of 1985	00 0000	Application Number			10/705,	573	
TRA	NSMITTAL		Filing Date			11/12/2	003	
1100	FORM		First Named Inventor		Phil	to J. Sclo	tino	
	FORM		Art Unit	<u> </u>		383		
	•		Examiner Name	 		J. E. Che	pm a n :	
(to be used for all	correspondence after in the		Attorney Docket Number	 				
Total Number of P	ages in Thie Submission	4					<u></u>	
ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)								
Fee Transan	allai Ferm		Drawing(s)			After A	llowance Communication to TC	
	Attached		Licensing-related Papers				Cemmunication to Board	
			Petition			Appea	Communication to TC Notice, Brief, Reply Srief)	
		١Ħ	Petition to Convert to a	(•*	
A74	r Final		Provisional Application Power of Attorney, Reyocation	n	Proprietary Information			
L Am⊪	davits/declaration(s)	ᄖ	Change of Correspondence			Status		
Extension of	of Time Request		Terminal Discisimer			Other below)	Enclosure(s) (please identify :	
Express Ab	andonment Request		Request for Refund				•	
Information	Disclosure Statement		CD, Number of CD(s)				. •	
_			Lendscape Table on CE)				
Certified Copy of Priority Remarks								
Document(s) Reply to Missing Parts/								
Incomplete	Application							
Lind	ply to Missing Parts fer 37 CFR 1.52 or 1,53							
SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT								
Firm Name	VIVIIA		TI DI LINOMITI, DE LO		, IN A 9	I		
			<u> </u>					
Signature		-	Jan Hall	1000	Com			
Printed name			Wemer H. Sc	hroeder	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	-	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Date	04/23/	05		Reg. No.			38,387	
	c	ERTIF	ICATE OF TRANSMISS	ION/MA	ILING			
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facalmile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on								
the date shown below:								
Signature								
								
Typed or printed na	arme i					Date		

This collection of Information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case, Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Petent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need exzistence in completing the form, call 1-900-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

Response to a second Office Action

Application No. 10/705,573

This communication is a response to a second Office Action but a first claim rejection. The communication has a mailing date of 04/15/2005 and sets forth a shortened statutory period for of three months which would expire on 07/15/2005.

Remarks

Claims 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eaton (6,755,001) in view of Dumlao (6,092,350).

First of all, applicant is claiming a wall and not a flooring system as is disclosed by both the references cited. A wall is constructed entirely different than a floor and, therefore, are not equal to each other in construction and in load bearing characteristics. The examiner cannot equate both to be wall(floor) as was done. The floor of Eaton is disseminated by the examiner as:

1) a fabric material 140 is being located on one side of the wall floor.

It is pointed out to the examiner that 140 is not a fabric at all. Eaton identifies the alleged fabric (examiner) (col. 6 lines 1 - 21) as a shrinkage shrinkage-control mesh 140 made of a cross-grid of metal rods, preferably of steel. The shrinkage control mesh 140 is laid such that that the mesh grid is generally oriented in the directions of bearing members 110 and joists 122, thus providing added concrete strength as well as shrinkage control. The fabric material in use by applicant is entirely different from the mesh identified by Eaton. Applicant's fabric is a woven or non-woven cloth. (Specification, page 1, under heading of "Summary of Invention"). Stated very simple, the mesh material of Eaton is no fabric and, therefore, this reference must fail as a base reference against the claims.

The examiner further states under: